

Developer Contributions Scoping Report Schedule of Responses

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
01	Severn Trent Water Ltd	Full Document	Mechanisms are in place for the water industry to ensure that funding is obtained for required infrastructure improvements.	Noted.
02	East Leicestershire & Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group	Full Document	Support the creation of SPD as Health services will have significant impacts from development which S106 contributions will have to mitigate.	Support is welcomed.
02	East Leicestershire & Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group	Contribution Terminology	General terminology would provide greater flexibility in long term. Ensure SPD clearly sets out level of contribution for health but is flexible to the changes that occur at either the CCG level or at the practice level.	The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultations with providers. However we do aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution.
02	East Leicestershire & Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group	Evidence Base	It would be useful to include all potential sources of funding that may be accessed to support innovative solutions such as the development of a health and leisure facility.	This may be better placed within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, as this will be used as source of how each contribution was calculated.
03	Anglian Water	Full Document	This area is served by Severn Trent therefore we are unable to comment on this application.	Noted.
04	East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Contribution List	Fully support the approach to health, healthy communities and affordable housing with an outwards glance to reducing deprivation within the community. I would also note that the emphasis on communities could lower the prevalence of social isolation and the associated health challenges therein.	Noted.
04	East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Councils Priorities	Caution is around how deliverable these contributions will be, so would encourage a robust position when negotiating with developers.	The SPD will set out how the council seeks to negotiate with developers along with illustrating the council's priorities to which this negotiation will be based.
04	East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Contribution Terminology	To ensure greater application of the SPD encourage a detailed overview of the contributions. This may avoid a selective view of the words and meaning.	The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers. However we do aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
04	East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Contribution List	Healthcare approaches may not typically be a standalone GP surgery, so would encourage early engagement with local Primary Care Networks. I would also give consideration to the provision of local Ambulance and police bases to ensure adequate cover within a growing populous.	Noted and welcomed. Through consultation with infrastructure providers, developers, councillors and the public, the SPD will establish what the council will seek from developers on a case by case basis. The police constabulary have also been consulted as part of this consultation.
05	Environment Agency	Contribution List	(Biodiversity) Net Gain is imminently due to be made mandatory under the Planning system. It is the Environment Agency understands that one of the mechanisms for ensuring the net gain is achieved would be via section 106 agreements (or equivalent) and on this basis the Local Authority should consider adding net gain to the list. Whilst the Environment Agency, as a matter of principle, would not wish to see the need for new flood defence infrastructure being required as a result of new development, the Local Authority may wish to consider adding this to the list under 2.3. As well the obvious, traditional, type of flood defence, e.g. flood defence walls, this could also include other forms of flood defence, and e.g. de-culverting works.	Noted and welcomed. Through consultation with infrastructure providers, developers, councillors and the public, the SPD will establish what the council will seek from developers on a case by case basis. However we are aware of how urgent Net Gain and flooding is becoming within the planning system.
05	Environment Agency	Contribution Terminology	The Environment Agency has no vies on this aspect – other than to state that the level of detail should be such that it is fit for purpose and ‘user-friendly’.	Noted.
06	Highways England	Full Document	Based on a review of the report and SEA Highways England has no comments to make, however, we welcome the clear arrangements set out by the Council to facilitate the delivery of high-quality development and supporting infrastructure in the area.	Noted and welcome the support.
07	Savills on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Ltd	Contribution Terminology	This SPD could provide upfront clarity for developers in terms of the likely requirements of a S106 agreement, thus speeding up the process. Benefit establishing the viability of a scheme prior to the	The council's intention for the SPD is to have the positive impact mentioned within this comment. We understand that the SPD will also have to be used on a site by site basis therefore flexibility

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
			<p>submission of a planning application. However, the Council should ensure that the SPD is not used as a means to frustrate development and retains a level of flexibility in order to adjust to changing market conditions.</p>	<p>will need to be</p>
07	Savills on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Ltd	Phasing and Triggers	<p>The discussion of phasing of contributions and triggers within S106 agreements is missing. The Phasing of payments can have an impact on delivery. As such, the balance between providing infrastructure at an appropriate time and ensuring that the development remains viable is a crucial element of this SPD and must be included.</p>	<p>Accept that phasing and triggers have been missed from the scoping report; however the council agrees that this will be included within the SPD as an important part of how developer contributions will be implemented.</p>
07	Savills on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Ltd	Breakdown of Contributions	<p>Given the differences between funding and delivery of specific type of infrastructure bespoke chapters to discuss individual elements, or groups of similar elements, is welcomed.</p>	<p>Noted this is the initial view is for the SPD to lay out details of each contribution it will seek.</p>
07	Savills on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Ltd	Contribution List	<p>Need to add below in order to make it more comprehensive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Cycle facilities / route upgrades <input type="checkbox"/> Upgrades to pedestrian routes <input type="checkbox"/> Open space maintenance / commuted sums 	<p>Noted. Through consultation with infrastructure providers, developers, councillors and the public, the SPD will establish what developer contributions the council will seek from developers on a case by case basis.</p>
07	Savills on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Ltd	Contribution Terminology	<p>Detailed calculations tend to speed up the process of agreeing S106 legal agreements. As the costs for contributions can be calculated by the applicant prior to the submission of a planning application limiting delays.</p> <p>Given that the new NPPF requires viability to be considered at the earliest stage possible, the inclusion of calculations is required in order that the applicant can come to a realistic position in terms of viability prior to formal consultation with statutory consultees.</p> <p>Drafts of SPD need to include calculations so that developers can assess if these are correct. Calculations included should also be index linked where appropriate.</p>	<p>The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers. However we do aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution. These will be illustrated in the draft for further comment.</p>

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
			There should also be regular reviews of the SPD and the calculations therein to ensure that they are reflective of changes in the market.	
07	Savills on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Ltd	Breakdown of Contributions	Believe the document should include the various contributions otherwise value is limited. The purpose of this document should be to present a holistic picture to developers of what they will be expected to contribute.	Noted, the SPD will aim to include details on the various contributions that will be sought by the council and its partners.
	Savills on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Ltd	Open Space	There needs to be flexibility in terms of management and maintenance of public open spaces. This is because what would be the optimal solution for one site would not necessary work for others therefore the body responsible for maintenance should be considered on a site by site basis. The inclusion of a formula for the calculation of a commuted sum for maintenance of open space should also be included.	Accepted that the best solutions for management and maintenance may differ from site to site, but there are clear community advantages from it being undertaken by the Council or local organisation, particularly if problems arise. It is the intention to include a formula for calculating the commuted sum for the provision and maintenance of open space in this SPD.
07	Savills on behalf of Barwood Development Securities Ltd	Evidence base	Concerned that the emerging Sustainable Neighbourhoods SPD is not referenced as something the SPD will use as a reference. It should be noted that the principle of the Sustainable Neighbourhoods SPD is not supported by Barwood, however in the event that the Council decides to progress the document, given the potential importance of both of these emerging SPDs to the delivery of the MNSN Barwood would expect the document to be prepared with reference to the masterplanning SPD.	Following receipt of comments on the Scoping report for the Sustainable Neighbourhoods SPD, the Council is considering whether or not to proceed with the masterplanning as an SPD or not. Cross referencing will be provided within the SPD to whatever the outcome of the masterplanning and delivery work is for sustainable neighbourhoods.
08	Harborough District Council	Full Document	We support your intention to prepare an SPD that covers Developer Contributions collection, spending and monitoring.	Noted and welcomed.
09	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited	Full Document	SPD is generally supported, provided it is properly framed to provide clear guidance on the nature and scale of contributions to be requested, taking proper account of viability.	Noted and support welcomed.
09	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons	Timeline	Critical to have full and proper consultation with the development industry as a key stakeholder. Given that	After further consideration and discussions we agree that the timescales of the project within

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
	Developments Limited		the consultation on the Scoping Report only ends on the 1st September, this timeframe is ambitious. Given the importance of stakeholder engagement, including with the development industry, the timescales should be pushed back to allow for stakeholder engagement in October/November with consultation on a draft SPD in the New Year.	the scoping report are too ambitious. Therefore the timeline will be amended and discussed with our project steering group, this will account for further engagement. Once finalised this will be published on the website.
09	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited	Contribution Terminology	To be useful the SPD will need to clearly set out what contributions are likely to be sought from different types and scales of development and how the contributions would be calculated.	Noted, the SPD will aim to include details on the various contributions that will be sought by the council and its partners.
09	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited	Monitoring	In terms of delivery and monitoring, the Council should commit to reporting on how section 106 contributions have been spent so that the process is transparent. This should include monitoring of agreements on a quarterly basis and an annual report on section 106 monies received and how it has been spent.	The SPD will set out how the council plan to monitor developer contributions, however in 2020 as stated in the new NPPF legislation the council will be required to publish the annual infrastructure funding statement therefore this mechanism will already be in place.
09	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited	Council Priorities	It is not clear how the SPD will state the Council's priorities and how this will be achieved, as the circumstances of individual applications can vary, particularly for those applications around Melton Mowbray compared with applications in the rural settlements. It would be useful if some indication was provided over how the Council will determine how it will prioritise specific contributions and this should consider the package of contributions likely to be sought including those for Leicestershire County Council and NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups.	The council will always assess planning applications on an individual basis; however consultations with MBC councillors will enable our negotiations to be focused on the council's priorities. The draft will illustrate how this will work, after a series of meetings with councillors and other partners.
09	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited	Contribution Terminology	Specific advice in relation to different types of contributions would be useful. This should include a clear statement of how contributions would be calculated and would also need to refer to the guidance prepared by LCC in relation to their likely requests. Any requested contributions must be fairly related in scale and kind to the development proposed and have proper regard to issues of viability.	Noted, this will be discussed with LCC prior to the draft SPD being produced.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
09	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited	Contribution List	In the past, there have been issues with contributions sought from the Police Authority and in relation to healthcare and the extent to which requested contributions met the statutory tests of being fairly and reasonably related to the development. It is assumed that the Council will be liaising with these infrastructure providers on the scale and nature of any contributions requested. The justification for contributions needs to be clearly stated and should be consulted on with the development industry as the SPD is prepared.	Noted, infrastructure providers will be consulted during the process of creating the draft SPD, and an evidence base will be sought for each contribution.
09	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited	Contribution Terminology	To be useful the SPD should provide clear guidance on how the scale of contributions for different types of contributions will be calculated.	The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers. However we do aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution.
09	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited	LCC Policy	The inclusion of contribution requirements from different agencies in one document would be clearer. However, given the recent adoption of the LCC S106 requirement document, it is not clear how this will be possible. Cross referencing to other relevant documents should be provided at the very least.	<p>Noted and welcomed, this will be discussed with LCC prior to the draft SPD being produced.</p> <p><u>LCC Response</u> We suggest that the LCC Planning Obligations Policy be appended (or a link is provided to the LCC website). That will allow for LCC to make changes / updates as appropriate without Melton BC needing to update its document.</p>
09	Pegasus Group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited	Open Space	It has generally been the case the management companies have been used on developments for the future maintenance of space given the general reluctance of district and parish councils to take on future maintenance. If the Council does decide to take on the management of open spaces, any contributions requested for the management and maintenance of spaces would need to be reasonable and would need to be implemented flexibly having regard to site viability.	There are clear community advantages that arise from the Council or other local organisation managing and maintaining open spaces, particularly if problems arise. It is the intention to include a formula for calculating the commuted sum for the provision and maintenance of open space in the draft SPD, so developers will have an opportunity to comment on whether they consider the costs to be reasonable then.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
10	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bellway Homes Limited (East Midlands)	Full Document	Bellway Homes support the preparation of a Developer Contribution SPD. Such SPD's are generally useful in providing a central point of reference, defining the scope of what can be requested and on what basis and value.	Noted and welcomed.
10	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bellway Homes Limited (East Midlands)	Scope of SPD	<p>Regulation 122 of The CIL Regulations 2010 should feature in the development of this SPD, its methodologies and calculations.</p> <p>The first bullet point confirms that the SPD will set out "reasons to why the various contributions are needed". This should be amended to ensure that the SPD will set out "justification as to why the various contributions are needed, consistent with the statutory requirements of Regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010".</p> <p>Bellway Homes are encouraged that the SPD sets out a strategy and policies to guide instances where development may be unviable. The suggestion that contributions "may need to be reduced or removed to ensure sustainable developments meet the delivery targets set out in the Local Plan" is also encouraged and fully supported.</p> <p>The SPD needs a logical and robust methodology. The use of the mechanism for considering viability and affordable housing commuted sums within the Housing Mix and Affordable Housing SPD should form the basis of such a mechanism for all developer contributions.</p>	Suggestions noted and support welcomed.
10	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bellway Homes Limited (East Midlands)	Contribution Terminology	SPD should provide specific advice on different types of contributions. Specific advice in the SPD should anticipate that contributions and the methodologies behind them can change. The SPD should therefore feature review mechanisms and be regularly updated	Noted, the SPD will aim to include details on the various contributions that will be sought by the council and its partners. The mechanisms for the SPDs review will be illustrated within the draft for further comments.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
			to ensure they remain accurate and useful.	
10	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bellway Homes Limited (East Midlands)	Contribution List	The current list appears to capture the typical selection of requested infrastructure needs of residential development. It should be noted that the specific needs and requests need to be considered on a site by site basis to ensure the requirements of Regulation 122 are satisfied.	Noted the council will ensure that Regulation 122 is met.
10	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bellway Homes Limited (East Midlands)	Contribution Terminology	To satisfy Regulation 122 detailed calculations should be required.	Noted the council will ensure that the SPD meets Regulation 122.
10	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bellway Homes Limited (East Midlands)	LCC Policy	The suggestion to capture all contributions in one document would be very sensible, however regard needs to be had to the contributions secured by Leicestershire County Council given the County are currently working on a revised strategy.	<p>Noted, this will be discussed with LCC prior to the draft SPD being produced.</p> <p><u>LCC Response</u> We suggest that the LCC Planning Obligations Policy be appended (or a link is provided to the LCC website). That will allow for LCC to make changes / updates as appropriate without Melton BC needing to update its document.</p>
10	Pegasus Group on behalf of Bellway Homes Limited (East Midlands)	Open Space	MBC as default position as they are in most cases best placed to understand the public's expectations and maintenance requirements. It is considered that this default position should be integrated into a hybrid model that provides an option to allow for developers to also elect how infrastructure, specifically open space, should be maintained (by the Council or a third party provider). Bellway Homes would support such a flexible model.	There are clear community and sustainability advantages that arise from the Council or other local organisation managing and maintaining open spaces, particularly if problems arise. The Council will need to be convinced that any other arrangements will not give rise to the problems it has experienced in getting problems rectified when management companies are remote and inflexible.
11	Gladman	Scope of SPD	Gladman broadly agree with the scope set by the Council. The SPD should provide sufficient clarity to aid interpretation and implementation of policies set out within the adopted Local Plan. However it should not be used as a method of introducing policy requirements via the backdoor outside of the Plan.	Welcome support, the SPD will be produced in line with the regulations which make it clear that SPDs should not add any new policies and should only be used as further guidance.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
11	Gladman	Contribution Terminology	Efforts should be made to ensure that the SPD is not overly prescriptive in the guidance it sets out in relation to developer contributions. It is important that the Council's approach holds sufficient flexibility to allow for deviation from plan requirements where it is sufficiently justified by site specific circumstances in order to secure viable and deliverable development.	The SPD will provide guidance on viability and sustainability of developments and in addition, the level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers. However we will aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution.
11	Gladman	Contribution List	<p>Whilst Gladman do not disagree with the list, remind MBC & partners that requests must meet the obligations tests as set out in Paragraph 56 of the 2019 NPPF.</p> <p>There may however be specific cases where the Council need to adopt an alternative approach for the developer contributions where these are related to the development of a large-scale stand-alone settlement. The adoption of this approach will simplify the pooling of contributions, whilst ensuring early delivery, and is often applied towards new settlements where development parcels contribute proportionately to infrastructure needs.</p>	<p>One aim of the SPD is to set out guidance to how the council plan to deal with applications that would require developer contributions, this approach will meet the requirements of the NPPF and the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2019.</p> <p>A case by case approach will still have to occur to ensure that each applications is analysed against the tests.</p>
11	Gladman	LCC Policy	The Council make clear which stakeholder is responsible for the request and, where possible, the delivery of each contribution tied to a development. A single document, such as the SPD, setting this out would be useful. In this regard, it is worth including a link to the recently revised and adopted Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy to provide for a complete source of information regarding developer contributions. Further relevant third-party documents relating to developer contributions, should also be provided where available.	<p>Noted, throughout this process we will be liaising with LCC and third-party infrastructure providers.</p> <p><u>LCC Response</u> We suggest that the LCC Planning Obligations Policy be appended (or a link is provided to the LCC website). That will allow for LCC to make changes / updates as appropriate without Melton BC needing to update its document.</p>
11	Gladman	Planning Applications	Gladman urge the Council and its partners to ensure that any requests made for contributions are done so as soon as practicable during the planning application process in order to aid the efficiency of the	One aim of the SPD is to set out guidance to how the council plan to deal with applications that would require developer contributions, this approach will meet the requirements of the

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
			<p>determination process and allow for time for negotiation within the statutory timescale if required. It would also be useful if guidance is provided at the pre-application stage as to the potential contribution requirements of a proposed development based on available information at that stage. The adoption of this approach may prevent future delay at or post the planning application stage.</p> <p>Any requests for contributions made to a planning application should be supported by clear evidence which illustrates that the request has been made in full accordance with Paragraph 56 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>NPPF and the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2019.</p>
11	Gladman	Contribution Terminology	<p>Gladman is supportive of the proposal to publish the formulas set to calculate contribution requirements. This will aid the negotiation process and should minimise the potential for dispute and delay. To provide for a fully transparent process, Gladman suggest that opportunity is given to comment on these formulas and costs where possible to ensure that these remain up-to-date with the latest position.</p>	<p>The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers. However we do aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution. Comments will still be received by MBC for further negotiation.</p>
11	Gladman	Monitoring	<p>In terms of delivery of infrastructure and monies collated from a development, Gladman request that information regarding how and where this is delivered is shared with the applicant in order to illustrate that the obligation tests have been met. This information can also be made available to the wider community to illustrate the benefits to their area which a development has provided.</p>	<p>The SPD will set out how the council plan to monitor developer contributions, however in 2020 as stated in the new NPPF legislation the council will be required to publish the annual infrastructure funding statement therefore this mechanism will already be in place. This data will be published on the council's website.</p>
11	Gladman	Phasing and Triggers	<p>Flexibility should be provided, as far as consistent with achieving sustainable development, with how contributions secured are delivered. This may include the phasing of payments/infrastructure in alignment with the delivery of housing on a site, in order to minimise upfront cost and associated risk. The adoption of this approach will be beneficial to the delivery rate of a development and will ensure that necessary infrastructure is delivered as it is required.</p>	<p>The phasing and triggers of developer contributions are important part of the section 106 process and will be detailed and included within the SPD.</p>

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
11	Gladman	Evidence Base	<p>Gladman is supportive of the list of documents referenced. The Council should also be careful not to alter development requirements significantly beyond those tested and examined through the Local Plans process in order to secure development viability and promote delivery.</p> <p>The Council should conduct a regular review of the Local Plan Viability Assessment to ensure that any potential changes to associated costs or requirements for infrastructure which might occur over the plan period are account for.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council has already carried out a refresh of the viability of the sustainable neighbourhood's part of the local plan viability and there will be a further wider refresh when it revisits whether CIL should be implemented or not. Additional financial burdens will only be applied where they are necessary.</p>
12	Network Rail	Contribution List	<p>Disappointed that list excludes any contributions that may address impact of developments on rail infrastructure, particularly in relation to level crossing impacts. A recent example is 17/00641/OUT at land north west of Bottesford station, where a number of station improvements and the downgrading of Bottesford station level crossing was obtained through negotiation. Level crossings represent the single biggest risk to the operation of the railway and thus we need to ensure the impact of new development is mitigated.</p> <p>In addition as there are 2 railway stations in the borough, large developments may have an effect on these facilities (Melton in particular). A significant issue is disable access which was a concern of CIL; however the principle of the new development shouldering the burden of its impact on existing uses (as covered in the NPPF) should be upheld.</p> <p>As such we would wish to see additions to the list to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary improvements to railway level crossings • Enhancements to railway station facilities. 	<p>Each of the Borough's infrastructure providers will be consulted prior to the creation of the draft SPD to obtain information regarding contributions to be sought.</p>
13	Greenlight	Evidence Base	<p>There appears to be a significant gap in the evidence</p>	<p>The omission of the July 2019 viability refresh</p>

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
	Developments		base, as the Council has not included the July 2019 Viability Refresh on the Melton Northern and Southern Strategic Neighbourhoods. It is assumed that this is because the content of this Viability Refresh has been called into question. The Viability Refresh is being revisited in-conjunction with Greenlight Developments and Davidsons. We are of the opinion that agreement of a revised Viability Refresh will be fundamental to the proposed SPD and therefore this SPD process needs to respect the on-going discussions taking place on the Viability Refresh with the two delivery partners for Melton South.	was an oversight – it will be part of the evidence base for the preparation of the SPD. Whilst the Council is aware of the concerns of some parties with its content, it is reiterated that the assessment is not a direct replacement for MBC/WP5, as the former was to assess CIL viability as well and as such took a cautious approach building in significant headroom to all its costs assumptions.
14	William Davis Limited	Full Document	Supports the principle of the SPD. However, the SPD needs to sit within the adopted policy scope of the Local Plan and the evidence base, Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and Viability Assessment upon which the Local Plan is based.	Noted and welcomes support.
14	William Davis Limited	Evidence Base	In respect of Policy SS4 and SS5 (regarding the Sustainable Neighbourhoods), we would expect any specific guidance for these to be set out in the Masterplan SPD's for these sites.	The relationship between the sustainable neighbourhoods' masterplanning SPD and this SPD will be worked on during the progression of these projects.
14	William Davis Limited	LCC Policy	The new LCC Developer Contribution policy document has no formal Development Plan status and therefore can only be given limited weight in preparing policy guidance for the SPD.	Noted. <u>LCC Response</u> The LCC planning obligations policy builds on and complements existing local plan and NPPF policy to secure sustainable development. There was never any intention for this to compete with local plan policy in terms of weight.
14	William Davis Limited	Contribution Terminology	In order to provide for a transparent, fair and consistent guidance the SPD needs to offer specific details for each contribution. This would enable the Document to be in accordance with NPPF para 57 and the CIL 122 limitations.	The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers. However we do aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
14	William Davis Limited	Contribution List	Agrees with the contributions listed but with the exception of Town Centre Management, as this is not referenced as far as we can see within relevant policies of the Local Plan or Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Noted and agree.
14	William Davis Limited	Contribution Terminology	The SPD should provide full details of any background formulas and triggers which will be used and give worked examples.	Noted. The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers. However we will aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution
14	William Davis Limited	Open Space	It's entirely up to the Council to decide if it wishes to provide or maintain green infrastructure but it should not do so at the exclusion of other third party providers or management company arrangements. Section 106 agreements should allow freedom for the developer to seek adoption of the open space by the Local Authority, or other third party, or future management and maintenance by Management Company.	There are clear community advantages that arise from the Council or other local organisation managing and maintaining open spaces, particularly if problems arise. It is the intention to include a formula for calculating the commuted sum for the provision and maintenance of open space in the draft SPD, so developers will have an opportunity to comment on whether they consider the costs to be reasonable then.
15	Historic England	SPD Scope	Considers the scope of the proposed SPD is too narrow as it does not include any reference to the historic environment or public realm. In that respect the relevant historic environment and public realm Local Plan policies would need to be included in the SPD.	Noted, Through consultation with infrastructure providers, developers, councillors and the public, the SPD will establish what the council will seek from developers on a case by case basis.
15	Historic England	Viability	The inclusion of a section on viability is supported (Para 2.2) since this can relate to Heritage at Risk cases and 'enabling' development in respect of heritage assets.	Noted.
15	Historic England	Contribution List	Inclusion of Public realm enhancement can often positively contribute to the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.	Noted and the example will be looked at as we prepare the draft SPD.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
			Dudley Council as an example of revised including heritage related elements, that may be required as part of a development proposal. In terms of the historic environment it clearly sets out situations when a planning obligation may be required, the type of planning obligation that may be required and sets out examples of obligation types. This can be appropriately set out using general wording.	
15	Historic England	Evidence base	<p>Historic England recommends inclusion of the following documents and guidance as part of the SPD evidence base:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streets for All; Advice for Highway and Public Realm Works in Historic Places • Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places • Heritage Counts (annual audit) 	Noted, these documents will be reviewed as to whether there input in needed in the SPD.
16	Taylor Wimpey c/o Turley	SPD Scope	<p>The SPD, if kept updated, can help inform the negotiation of developer contributions. However the approach used should be on a case by case basis. The situation is often complex, in particular with regards to sustainable neighbourhoods. Therefore it is vital that the guidance set out in this SPD does not undermine the deliverability of the plan. This can only be achieved if the SPD adopts a flexible approach allowing for changes in market conditions.</p>	The SPD will aim to provide guidance on the approach we will use for each application. The way developer contributions work and the regulations attached to them means that that each application will need to be assessed on a case by case basis this will still be the case as different contributions may apply to certain developments and areas.
16	Taylor Wimpey c/o Turley	Sustainable Neighbourhoods	<p>Proposed content is acceptable. However it should be made clear that the approach set out in the SPD may not be relevant to the Melton Mowbray SUEs. The upfront infrastructure costs of the SUEs will be significantly higher than other housing schemes and as such an alternative approach to that set out in the SPD may be entirely reasonable.</p>	The relationship between the sustainable neighbourhoods' masterplanning SPD and this SPD are still being worked through. Content will be in either the SN SPD or the Planning Obligations SPD with cross referencing, but not duplication.
16	Taylor Wimpey c/o Turley	Contribution List	<p>Yes it would appear to adequately encompass the infrastructure needs that are likely to arise from new developments.</p>	Noted and welcomed.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
16	Taylor Wimpey c/o Turley	Contribution Terminology	For transparency it would be useful to provide the detailed calculations. However in some cases it may be more appropriate to explain the general approach rather than set out detailed calculations. However we would expect that planning obligations will be determined on a case by case basis rather than using a standardised calculation.	Noted. The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers. However we do aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution.
16	Taylor Wimpey c/o Turley	Combined Document	Think all contributions should be in one document as long as the information is kept up to date.	Noted. <u>LCC Response</u> We suggest that the LCC Planning Obligations Policy be appended (or a link is provided to the LCC website). That will allow for LCC to make changes / updates as appropriate without Melton BC needing to update its document.
16	Taylor Wimpey c/o Turley	Open Space	We consider that MBC should provide and maintain infrastructure rather than third party providers.	Noted.
17	Anglian Water	Full Document	Anglian Water as a water and sewerage company seeks fair contributions through charges directly from developers under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. As such we would not, in most cases, make use of planning obligations.	Noted and welcomed.
18	Natural England	Full Document	It is important that the SPD acknowledges that the Melton Green Infrastructure network (policy EN3) is relevant to the SPD. We therefore welcome the recognition of its relevance. They have no comments on the SEA assessment.	Noted and welcomed.
19	Leicestershire County Council (Waste Management, Environment & Transport)	Contribution Terminology	Contribution types vary; therefore, it would seem practical to provide specific advice relating to each different type of contribution. The more transparent guidance that is available the better.	The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers and councillors. However we do aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
19	Leicestershire County Council (Waste Management, Environment & Transport)	Contribution List	The list seems comprehensive, however would be more robust in mentioning non-monetary contributions. Recommend changing the reference to civic amenity to Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) to reflect the more up to date terminology and also add in Waste Transfer Station.	Noted.
19	Leicestershire County Council (Waste Management, Environment & Transport)	Contribution Terminology	Detailed calculations would be helpful and should be used where possible.	The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers and Councillors. However we do aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution.
19	Leicestershire County Council (Waste Management, Environment & Transport)	Combined Document	Reasoning for both ways. If the sections were all together, then the reader could quickly and easily review other sections as required when necessary. However, if the sections were separate then the reader could just review the section they needed.	Noted. <u>LCC Response</u> We suggest that the LCC Planning Obligations Policy be appended (or a link is provided to the LCC website). That will allow for LCC to make changes / updates as appropriate without Melton BC needing to update its document.
19	Leicestershire County Council (Waste Management, Environment & Transport)	Evidence base	The Leicestershire Planning Obligations Policy 2019 – It is positive that this policy has been referenced and we would like to reiterate that Melton Borough Council should be mindful of the LCC Planning Obligations Policy in their development of the SPD.	Noted.
19	Leicestershire County Council (Transport Strategy & Policy, Environment & Transport)	Contribution List	It is common for the Local Highways Authority (LHA) to request a contribution towards passenger transport services as such we suggest this should be added to the list. We suggest that these transport elements could be rationalised into a series of more broadly-worded contributions which provide greater flexibility to pool contributions towards holistic transport mitigation, including measures developed through the Melton	As this SPD will be created using the content of the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2019. Therefore pooling contributions will be allowed so considerations of this will be made when producing the draft SPD. The incorporation of contributions managed by LCC will be discussed throughout the process.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
			Mowbray Transport Strategy. The LHA would welcome opportunities to help shape an alternative set of transport contributions.	
19	Leicestershire County Council (Children & Family Services)	SPD Scope	Children and Family Services approve the principal of developing a SPD and this will assist with the strategic planning of school places. However the current Scoping Report does not accurately reflect the education requirements.	Noted and welcome support, however The scoping report illustrates the broad proposals of the SPD and does not provide specific details on each contribution.
19	Leicestershire County Council (Children & Family Services)	Contribution Terminology	At MBC's request, we have developed a methodology to calculate S106 contributions to cover all education provision, this is based on a per dwelling contribution of £12,422. The S106 contributions for the Richborough and LCC applications which have recently secured an outline planning permission for a school were based on this per dwelling figure.	Noted.
19	Leicestershire County Council (Historic and Natural Environment)	Evidence Base	We suggest that the LCC policy is referred to (and dated), alongside a link to the webpage as the document will be subject to change from time to time and will allow developers to refer to the most up to date copy	Noted, this will be discussed with LCC prior to the draft SPD being produced.
20	Broughton and Old Dalby Parish Council	SPD Scope	The Parish Council (PC) agrees with the broad proposed content particularly when contributions are to be developed and the opportunity for PC's to be involved in discussions requirements.	Noted and support welcomed.
20	Broughton and Old Dalby Parish Council	Contribution Terminology	The guidance should go into each contribution type however the PC believes it should use general terminology. In addition however there is belief that the documents should be kept separate.	The level of detail provided on each contribution will be dependent on the contribution's attributes along with the responses and consultation with the service providers. However we do aim to be as clear as possible on how much the council will seek on each contribution.
20	Broughton and Old Dalby Parish Council	Contribution List	The PC thinks that road contributions should include specific pavement requirements.	Noted. Through consultation with infrastructure providers, developers, councillors and the public, the SPD will establish what developer contributions the council will seek from developers on a case by case basis.

No.	Organisation	Comments on Issue	Summary of Representation	Council Response
20	Broughton and Old Dalby Parish Council	Open Space	In terms of open space - Providing funding should enable some maintenance at PC level.	Noted.
20	Broughton and Old Dalby Parish Council	Evidence base	PC recommends the use of neighbourhood plans as part of the evidence base.	Noted.
21	Melton Borough Council	Contribution List	Need to ensure the process of creating the SPD investigates the provision and incorporation of Open Spaces, the provision of leisure within the Borough and cemeteries within the context of developer contributions. This will ensure services are able to cope with the future growth.	The SPD will be created through the cooperation with a range of partners including internal departments, therefore we will investigate various contribution possibilities

For any questions or queries regarding this document please contact;

planningpolicy@melton.gov.uk

01664 502502

Planning Policy
Parkside
Station Approach
Burton Street
Melton Mowbray
LE13 1GH